

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed September 15, 2004 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-16 and 18-23 are pending, the independent claims being 1 and 22. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

The specification stands objected to for not including, in the first sentence, a specific reference to the priority application. The specification is now amended to provide the specific reference.

The specification stands objected to for lack of antecedent basis for the expressions “file module” and “directory module.”

Firstly, the specification recites neither expression; instead, reference is made to a file and directory module (page 3, lines 2-3, 27; page 6, lines 22-27).

Moreover, the reference to a file and directory module is clear from context throughout the specification, as would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-16 and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,496,896 to Inoue.

Inoue fails to disclose or suggest, “A transmission system . . . the receiver being arranged to store, for retrieval upon subsequent playback, . . . under a predetermined grouping formulation . . . with said predetermined grouping formulation for storage being at the module level,” language explicitly appearing in the present claim 1.

The Office Action cites lines 46-67 of column 18 in Inoue, but this passage merely describes the conventional DSM-CC system.

For at least this reason, the cited reference fails to anticipate the present invention as recited in claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 22 recites the same above-quoted language, except that “said predetermined grouping formulation for storage being at the elementary level.”

Inoue fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

The Office Action fails to cite any additional passage from Inoue, or from any authority whatsoever.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Inoue in view of allegedly admitted prior art (hereinafter “AAPA”).

Claim 23 depends from claim 22. The AAPA fails to make up for the shortcomings in Inoue.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Amendment  
Serial No. 09/881,599



Docket No. NL 000395

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Russell Gross  
Registration No. 40,007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Steve Cha", written over a horizontal line.

By: Steve Cha  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,069

Date: December 15, 2004

**Mail all correspondence to:**  
Russell Gross, Registration No. 40,007  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9608  
Fax: (914) 332-0615

**Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP NON-FEE AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313 on December 15, 2004.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069  
(Name of Registered Rep.)

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Steve Cha", written over a horizontal line.  
(Signature and Date)